

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the further amendment of claim 13 above, and comments which follow.

In the Office Action, the Examiner continues to reject claims 13-15 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook U.S. Patent No. 6,675,975. With the exception of claims 24 and 25, the remaining claims have also been rejected on the basis of obviousness, when Cook is combined with the teachings of another reference. While the indicated allowability of the subject matter of claims 24 and 25 is gratefully acknowledged, it is submitted that, upon reconsideration, all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 13 has been amended to emphasize the technical feature that only some of the ribs are internally reinforced. That, is it submitted, is an important distinction.

Cook et al. is owned by the assignee of the present application. The Examiner argues that the only difference between claim 13 and Cook et al. is that the subframe in Cook et al. does not include rigid metal having a hollow box cross-section, and that inclusion of this technical feature would be within the normal activities of a person skilled in the art.

However, the Examiner appears to have overlooked a further distinction over Cook et al. Claim 13 additionally requires that only some of the ribs are internally reinforced by rigid metal members, leaving some of the ribs not being reinforced. It can be seen that all the embodiments in Cook et al. show each of the ribs being reinforced by rigid metal members.

As argued previously, designing a suitable screen frame which has acceptable rigidity while also remaining sufficiently lightweight is a challenging task. The screen disclosed in Cook et al. achieves, to a certain degree, rigidity without incurring a significant weight increase. However, as discussed on page 4 lines 18 to 24 of the present application, the screen frame of the present invention is distinguished over Cook et al. in that it achieves superior rigidity without incurring any weight increase.

This advantageous arrangement is achieved by the two points of distinction between claim 13 and the disclosure in Cook et al., namely that the sub-frame is internally reinforced by rigid metal having a hollow box cross-section and also, to reduce any weight introduced by this feature, that only some of the ribs are internally reinforced by rigid metal members, leaving some of the ribs not being reinforced.

While applicant accepts that minor modifications of the disclosure in Cook et al. may fall within the normal activities of a person skilled in the art, the present invention does not correspond to such a situation. Simply adding further metallic structure to a screen frame is likely to improve rigidity at the expense of increased weight and simply removing metallic structure is likely to reduce rigidity while saving weight.

The inventive development of the present invention is the combination of particular adaptations involving the specific structure included in the sub-frame and in the ribs. By specifically selecting to introduce further metallic structure in the sub-frame and also reducing the amount of metallic structure in the ribs, it has been surprisingly found that an improvement in rigidity may be achieved without incurring a weight increase. The invention is therefore a significant one, because improvements in rigidity are usually accompanied by an increase in weight, which is not the case in the present invention.


It therefore would not be within the normal activities of the person skilled in the art to adapt the disclosure in Cook et al. by making these two adaptations simultaneously and therefore, the improvements achieved by the invention as claimed in claim 13 demonstrate that such a claim is a non-obvious improvement over Cook et al.

It is therefore submitted that claim 13 distinguishes from the prior art and is allowable thereover. The remaining claims depend from claim 13, and are submitted to be allowable, as well.

The Examiner's further and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore urged.

August 7, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William M. Lee, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized with a large, looped "L" and a trailing flourish.

William M. Lee, Jr.

Registration No. 26935

Barnes & Thornburg LLP

P.O. Box 2786

Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786

(312) 214-4800

(312) 759-5646 – Fax